

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

(As amended and approved during June 4, 2003 SRFB meeting)

May 1 & 2, 2003

Cascade Room, Red Lion Hotel
Wenatchee, Washington

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Larry Cassidy	Vancouver
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
James Peters	Olympia
Steve Tharinger	Clallam County
Ed Manary	Designee, Conservation Commission
Tim Smith	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Dick Wallace	Designee, Department of Ecology
Shari Schafflein	Designee, Department of Transportation

CALL TO ORDER

Meeting opened by Chair at 8:35 a.m. Agenda was reviewed and approved.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY MEETING MINUTES

Larry Cassidy **moved** to accept the March 2003 meeting minutes. Brenda McMurray **seconded** the motion. **Approved** by the Board.

MANAGEMENT AND STATUS REPORTS

Director's Report:

Laura Johnson gave the director's report.

- Complimented SRFB staff and partners who have worked hard getting ready for this meeting.
- Announced that Bruce Crawford received the Governor's Distinguished Manager's award, one of only 16 in the state. Chairman Ruckelshaus agreed this was a well-deserved honor for Bruce.

Financial Report:

Debra Wilhelmi presented the financial report. (See notebook for details.)

Projects Report:

Rollie Geppert presented this agenda item. (See notebook for details.)

Chair Ruckelshaus asked about the low number of closed projects. Rollie responded that there are many reasons it may take time for the projects to be completed such as waiting for permitting, construction delays, or the projects have been completed but the final inspections have not been completed, or the projects are still open due to monitoring requirements.

Legislative Update:

Jim Fox gave the legislative report.

Regular session closed on Sunday, April 27, without a budget. The Legislature will convene a 30-day special session May 12 (ends June 12) to complete the budget. Several bills that would have affected the SRFB died. There are still bills that may be acted upon during the special session. Although the monitoring bill died, it may be acted upon through the budget process.

Chair Ruckelshaus reviewed the comprehensive monitoring strategy and how the system was envisioned to work over time. The original strategy required \$90 million to fully implement. The first phase request was for \$10 million. The current proposed budget amount for monitoring is less than this, although it would help to continue with the work currently underway.

Director Johnson noted that the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) is currently undergoing a performance audit by the inspector general of the federal funds being used in Oregon for salmon recovery. Oregon is ahead of Washington on a number of monitoring issues.

Tim Smith reported that sometimes when the Legislature fails to act on a bill such as monitoring it is showing that they disagree with the proposal. This is not the case with the monitoring issue: the Legislature is supportive of monitoring and agrees that monitoring efforts need to continue through a collaborative process.

GSRO REPORT

Written report only. Steve Meyer will provide a GSRO update during his presentation on Friday. (See notebook for details.)

Director Johnson highlighted the letter sent by Governor Locke to the congressional delegation outlining the salmon priorities the Governor is suggesting for our federal delegation.

FOURTH ROUND GRANTS

Staff Report:

Laura Johnson and Rollie Geppert presented this item. (See notebook and handouts for details.)

Laura and Rollie reviewed previous grant rounds, the Fourth Round process, technical review process, the use of lead entity strategies, estimated funds for the next biennium, future grant cycles, and discussed possible funding approaches for the Board to take in this grant cycle.

Dick Wallace discussed how it is not only important to look at the strategies overall but the SRFB should be able to see how each project links to the specific strategies for funding. Linking local priorities to statewide actions.

Tim Smith asked if the \$14 million federal 03 money is a net amount. He also asked why there is a difference between the \$14 million in FFY03 and \$10 million in FFY04 and FFY05. Director Johnson responded that the \$14 million is net. The difference is that staff is assuming the state will receive less funding in the near future and monitoring requirements may be added.

Director Johnson noted that staff has estimated budgets on the more conservative side; would rather come back to the Board with additional funding than to come back needing to make cuts to the budget estimates.

Brenda McMurray asked when the state and federal funds would be available. Director Johnson reported the \$13.8 million in state funding is currently available and \$14 million federal funds will be available in about two months. Federal 04 and 05 funds are unknown at this time and could vary greatly.

The Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Funds (PCSRF) were originally designed to be in place for five years; the last year of this funding would be FFY03. The Congress has signaled they will continue these funds in FFY04 but funding in FFY05 is not assured. Another factor that could limit future funds is a request from the state of Idaho to be included in the PCSR funding.

Larry Cassidy noted that he and Tom Karrier played a role in a letter to Congress where Idaho's Governor wants to be included in the Pacific Coastal Salmon Act. This letter strictly limits Idaho's participation in that if they become part of the Pacific Coastal Salmon Act. The money Idaho would receive would be an amount over and above the current level of funding for states now receiving PCSR Funds.

Director Johnson further reviewed budget concerns, status of Governor's, Senate, and House proposed 2003-05 budgets, and provisos being discussed in the Legislature that would affect the Board's budget.

Craig Partridge asked about the Legislature's current reappropriation concerns. Director Johnson explained that money is issued in two-year blocks and the Legislature wants to see projects completed within the two-years. Many times project sponsors receive the funds near the end of the two-year period and it is impossible to complete projects prior to the end of the two-year timeline. This is a very important factor to consider for the Fifth Round. The Board policies require projects be completed within five years. Craig said the Board has been presenting awards near the end of the funding cycles and may want to think about award timing in future grant cycles to help alleviate this reappropriation problem.

Ed Manary asked about the Legislature putting a limitation on reappropriations. Jim Fox explained that in the House Capital budget there is a proviso on reappropriation amounts from prior biennia for the SRFB and in December 2003 the Board needs to explain why it hasn't spent the balance of these funds. There is some general language in the Senate Capital budget relating to all capital projects limiting it to two biennia to spend the funds. The Chair feels it is appropriate to explain why the funds haven't been

spent. Ed is concerned with the number of projects that have not been completed in relation to the number of projects funded.

Director Johnson explained that staff has kept close track of the projects. Many times it is outside influences causing delays in project completion such as permitting requirements, fish work windows, and monitoring requirements.

Tim Smith noted that there may be other ways to look at the reappropriations to see if there are ways to cut the amount or better explain what is happening. Laura explained that the process is there and staff will keep a close eye on this issue.

NOAA Fisheries has been working on performance indicators for the Federal 03-04 funds. This may cause the Board to adjust funding to allow collection of the required data. NOAA Fisheries currently has 54 proposed indicators. Bruce Crawford is working on limiting the number of indicators. Debra Wilhelmi is preparing to revise the PRISM database to collect the information needed. PRISM currently has more project specific information than any other data system in the Northwest.

Grant Cycles:

Rollie reviewed previous cycles and outlined the options.

The grant cycle timing will be discussed and decided at the June meeting.

Funding Approach:

Director Johnson reviewed the process used by staff for the funding recommendations presented to the Board. (See Table 1, page 11, staff memorandum, Topic #4, May 1 & 2 SRFB meeting notebook)

She noted staff's view that, for the 5th Round, the Board needs additional criteria for funding recommendations.

Technical Panel Comments:

Jeanette Smith – Aquatic Ecologist – this is the second year she has been on the Technical Panel.

- Thought the team approach was more effective and valuable for the group; it helped the Technical Panel get to know the lead entities better.
- What the teams were able to do with the lead entities was still limited. They were only able to work with the local Technical Advisory Groups (TAGs) and citizen panels and in some cases go on site visits of previously funded projects.
- She would like to be able to see current projects and meet with the project sponsors.
- Application format was much improved.
- Quality of proposals was improved.
- Panel continues to struggle with applying benefit and certainty over the different types of projects.
- In some lead entities there are many active projects so they may have presented a shorter list of less developed projects in the 4th Round due to the workload with previously funded projects.
- She didn't see many of changes in the strategies but organizations are using strategies to select projects.

Brenda McMurray thanked Jeanette for the time spent on the Technical Panel. This is a learning process and a continuing process to bring our salmon back. Brenda asked for more detail on the strategies. Is the format easy to use and are the elements there or are they missing? And, are they being used.

Jeanette responded that several lead entities clearly explained their strategies and others are still working toward this level of expertise.

Craig Partridge asked Jeanette to compare the significance between high and medium and between medium and low. He asked if there is more of a distinction between high and medium or more between medium and low.

Jeanette responded it is usually easier to identify the low benefit and certainty, and it is sometimes fuzzier between the high and medium benefit and certainty of projects.

Dick Wallace asked how the strategies get beyond the project level to the broader watershed level.

Jeanette responded that many of the strategies are doing that and have started to communicate this to their local community groups. All of the projects that come forward may not hit within that target, but it is starting to be reflected in the project lists presented.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked to be reminded why the Technical Panel was not able to view the proposed projects or meet with the sponsors.

Rollie Geppert noted that due to time and budget constraints the panel was not able to look at new projects.

Jeanette suggested that in future grant cycles, the Board could split the team and make sure at least one of the panel members has seen all of the proposed projects in the lead entity area. (Although, she pointed out, seeing a project is not necessarily a good thing for the sponsor.)

Lead Entity Advisory Group (LEAG) Comments:

Jay Watson reported that the 2003 workshop will help address some of the Technical Panel concerns listed in the Board memorandum. Lead entity strategies are not the only area there is ambiguity or uncertainty in the overall process. Strategies need to be addressed, but other issues that need addressing are the Technical Panel (tasked vaguely on both the strategy and benefit and certainty) and staff report preparation. From the lead entity perspective, there are several issues that need to be addressed. The workshop will focus on the strategies but the other issues need to be looked at.

Chair Ruckelshaus agreed there are issues that need to be addressed. The steering committee is working on some of the issues and the 5th Round workgroups are working on other issues.

Jay reported the Lead Entity Advisory Group (LEAG) meeting on April 11 was very well attended. Comments were unanimous strong and clear.

- Fund as many projects as possible now – do not wait until June - Seems arbitrary to cap the funding now based on future funding.
- When you delay a project you can't go back and miss a life-cycle for a fish.
- Would like to maintain the current cycle timing – could look at lots of different issues but should keep the same cycle for consistency to the project sponsors.

The workshop needs the Board to put up more sideboards so the issues are clear for the lead entities. The lead entities want more details on what a good project is, possibly providing more points for projects meeting certain criteria.

Jay stressed the need for Board members and agency heads to attend the lead entity workshop on May 15 and 16.

Dick Wallace commented that Jay's report is in direct line with his way of thinking after looking over the projects presented. He would like to see more thought to additional direction on percentages for project types, listed fish versus non-listed, links to limiting factors analyses, etc.

Lead Entity Testimony

Opening comments from the Chair outlined:

- The difficult economic times,
- The need to work with Congress and the State Legislature to continue to receive salmon recovery funding,
- The need to demonstrate progress being made in salmon recovery efforts, and
- The need to resolve several issues before starting the next grant round.

Whatcom County:

Spokesperson(s): John Thompson

This lead entity submitted a list containing 8 projects requesting a total of \$1,675,737 in SRFB funds.

Limiting factors analysis has been completed in this area. They have watershed planning under 2514.

The Board has funded over 30 projects in WRIA 1. So far, 12 are completed and another 12 should be completed soon.

John reviewed the various project types requesting funding in this watershed.

San Juan Conservation District:

Spokesperson(s): David Hoopes

This lead entity submitted a list containing 2 projects requesting a total of \$237,118 in SRFB funds.

Mr. Hoopes noted the strong public support for the Deer Harbor project and appreciation of the SRFB's assistance and support of salmon recovery efforts in WRIA 2.

Skagit Watershed Council:

Spokesperson(s): Shirley Solomon and Steve Hinton

This lead entity submitted a list containing 18 projects requesting a total of \$4,745,770 in SRFB funds.

Thanked staff, but were disappointed in the level of funding proposed this year. Would like to request additional funding for projects 5 and 6 (02-1563, Fornsby Creek SRT and 02-1620, Minkler Lake Acquisition). Project 5 would provide a self-regulating tide gate and has a tribal partner. Updated information on project 6 indicates more “bang for the buck” than when originally submitted.

Steve Hinton provided an overview of the Skagit lead entity process and the strategy.

Ed Manary noted the Limiting Factors Analysis for this area will be completed soon.

Steve Tharinger asked about the temperature problem with project 5 and whether the tide gates would help this issue. Steve Hinton disagreed that there is a temperature problem but feels the tide gate will increase the water mixing and help with any possible temperature problems.

Larry Cassidy asked Shirley how she would have changed the process if she would have known there was a limited amount of funds? She was not be able to answer that question now but would like to see a specific funding amount at the beginning of the next grant cycle.

Jim Peters asked if projects 5 and 6 weren’t funded in this cycle would the project need go away? Shirley was unable to answer for sure since it would depend on the landowners’ willingness to wait and other issues.

Director Johnson asked Shirley about a comment letter received asking the Board to not fund the number one project (02-1492, Wiley Slough Restoration Design). Shirley has been in contact with the Department of Fish and Wildlife concerning this comment letter and Tim Smith will provide WDFW support for this project.

Tim Smith supports this project and it fits into the strategy and limiting factors in this watershed. Understands the concern of the protester but feels it is a WDFW issue to work with the protestor on this issue.

Stillaguamish Tribe/Snohomish County WRIA 5:

Spokesperson(s): Aaron Waller and Peggy Bill

This lead entity submitted a list containing 8 projects requesting a total of \$1,409,283 in SRFB funds.

Supports staff recommendation to fund top three projects and will focus on the fourth project on the list (02-1654, Lower Pilchuck Creek Acquisition). Aaron would like to request funding of this project. Feels this is a high benefit project because it is habitat

for fall Chinook stock. This is a high priority area for protection. Believes the NMFS TRT would support this request also.

Peggy Bill noted there is a willing landowner who is proposing alternate uses that are very threatening to wildlife.

Island County:

Spokesperson(s): No one presented testimony.

This lead entity submitted a list containing 2 projects requesting a total of \$777,200 in SRFB funds.

Snohomish County WRIA 7:

Spokesperson(s): Martha Neuman, Stephanie Kaknes, and Peggy Bill

This lead entity submitted a list containing 10 projects requesting a total of \$2,176,449 in SRFB funds.

Martha introduced the lead entity overview and discussed the “provisioned” number one project (02-1629, Pearsons Eddy Acquisition) and presented the need to fund this project. Technical Panel was concerned whether removal of the flood-control gate would be adequate. The Snohomish lead entity feels removal of the flood-control gate will help to restore the floodplain action.

Peggy Bill thanked the Board for what they are doing and wanted to let the Board know that funding of the number one project is a wise use of SRFB funds.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked Director Johnson to explain the provisional funding status. Ms. Johnson explained the staff’s thinking on including a “proviso” on the top ranked one or two projects that had a low rating. These are important projects to the local lead entity but the SRFB Technical Panel had concerns. If the Board agrees, staff would do additional work and bring these projects back before the Board at the June meeting for potential funding with provisions in place.

Larry Cassidy asked about the disconnect between the SRFB Technical Panel and the lead entity. The Technical Panel says there are dikes mentioned in the application and the lead entity says there are no dikes.

Peggy Bill responded that there is armoring and she may have used the wrong term in the past.

Brenda McMurray would like clarification on where this project lies in the strategy and watershed priority areas. Where is the tide gate, is it currently open or closed, and where does the water go? She is not requesting an answer now but before funding would be granted.

Shari Schaftlein pointed out the number one ranked project does have a bridge scour problem upstream that will be taken care of in the future but not right away. Martha

noted that there are letters of support from both the Snohomish County and WDFW to restore the property.

King County WRIA 9:

Spokesperson(s): Doug Osterman

This lead entity submitted a list containing 5 projects requesting a total of \$2,342,175 in SRFB funds.

Doug thanked the Board, staff and Kristi Lynett and Brian Walsh. Feels King 9 presented a good project list. This list would have been funded in past grant cycles. The cap of \$1.4 million does not provide funding to the third phase Kanaskat Project. This is a good project and has a very high certainty of success if funded.

There are two other good projects that rated medium that would probably have been funded in past cycles.

Doug noted that King WRIA 9 is actually a multi-WRIA lead entity planning area, picking up parts of WRIA 8 and 15.

King County WRIA 8:

Spokesperson(s): Jean White and Jane Lamensdorf-Bucher

This lead entity submitted a list containing 5 projects requesting a total of \$1,846,963 in SRFB funds.

Jean White appreciates this round and thinks the idea of provisional funding of the top ranked projects is a good idea although it doesn't affect the King County WRIA 8 lead entity this year.

Would like additional funding for the third project (02-1550, Cedar/Taylor Creek Acquisition and Restoration). Additional funding has been secured by the project sponsor, which will reduce the amount of funding requested from the SRFB by \$100,000.

Ed Manary asked if land use restrictions were in place to protect the land in the future. Jean White reported that she believed they were.

Pierce County:

Spokesperson(s): David Renstrom, Tom Beavers, and Leslie McConnell

This lead entity submitted a list containing 10 projects requesting a total of \$3,069,115 in SRFB funds.

Dave reviewed the Pierce County lead entity process and requested funding for the top four projects (Provisional 02-1585, Boise Creek Restoration; Provisional 02-1582, West Hylebos Creek Restoration/Preservation; staff recommended for funding 02-1579, Foothills Trail Culvert Replacement; and not recommended for funding 02-1570, Coal Creek Fish Passage Restoration).

Tom Beavers presented testimony on the top ranked project. King County is proposing to reduce the funding to \$798,000. King County has the experience and expertise to complete a project of this proportion. The lead entity ranked this project number one. If there is still concern about fish benefit, suggested delaying funding until June meeting.

Leslie McConnell, city of Federal Way, recommended funding of the West Hylebos wetland at the revised amount of \$420,000 and as an acquisition only. The property owner is willing to sell the 33 acres.

Dick Wallace asked about restoring the channel on the golf course at its current location for the number one project. Tom Beavers reported that they did look at leaving the channel in place but the cost would actually be higher.

Jim Peters asked if the sponsor was working with the Puyallup Tribe for the Hylebos property. Leslie reported that the Puyallup Tribe is working on projects above and below the project site. The project is not on tribal property.

Dave spoke regarding the number four project and noted this is a barrier removal project. He felt this project should have high certainty of success.

Nisqually River Salmon Recovery:

Spokesperson(s): Chad Stussy

This lead entity submitted a list containing 11 projects requesting a total of \$3,665,504 in SRFB funds.

Chad read a statement from David Troutt, Nisqually River lead entity coordinator, stressing the need to fund additional projects on the Nisqually project list and concern with the staff funding recommendations. Additional funding requests include the following projects: 02-1535, Weyco Mashel Shoreline Acquisition; 02-1493, Markus Shoreline Acquisition; 02-1536, Nisqually Restoration Feasibility Study; and 02-1473, Brighton Creek Culvert Replacement.

Thurston Conservation District:

Spokesperson(s): Amy Wineka and Chad Stussy

This lead entity submitted a list containing 4 projects requesting a total of \$1,691,285 in SRFB funds.

Amy reported that she is now the lead entity coordinator for both the Mason and Thurston County lead entities. Although these groups are still separate entities, they are combining some activities such as strategy development.

Mason Conservation District:

Spokesperson(s): Amy Wineka

This lead entity submitted a list containing 3 projects requesting a total of \$474,862 in SRFB funds.

Thanked the Board and staff and reviewed the Mason process and partnerships that have been built over the past couple years.

Jim Peters recognized Amy's direction and leadership with the lead entity.

Brenda McMurray recognized the first two projects on the list (02-1574, Melaney Creek Fish Passage Project and 02-1591, Little Skookum Valley Phase 1: Passage) were an outcome from a previously funded assessment project. Brenda would like to have these projects be included in the projects being monitored.

Kitsap County:

Spokesperson(s): Monica Daniels, Paul Dorn, Jim Bolger, and Paul Nelson

This lead entity submitted a list containing 13 projects requesting a total of \$6,421,849 in SRFB funds.

Requested additional funding for the fourth project (02-1567, Chico Creek Bridge Installation) noting that Kitsap County Public Works is providing an additional \$50,000 in match from their surface water funds.

North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity:

Spokesperson(s): Jenny Nixon, Mike McHenry, and Andy Richie

This lead entity submitted a list containing 8 projects requesting a total of \$3,902,032 in SRFB funds.

Requested additional funding for projects 5 and 6 on the list (02-1583, Deep Creek and South Fork Pysht River LWD Restoration and 02-1581, Brownes Creek Instream Habitat Restoration).

Brenda McMurray suggested the number one project (02-1621, Sequim Prairie Tri-Irrigation Reservoir) be brought back to the Board in June for funding or condition to have water go into trust.

Hood Canal Coordinating Council:

Spokesperson(s): Jay Watson, Randy Johnson, and Paula MacKrow

This lead entity submitted a list containing 19 projects requesting a total of \$3,240,572 in SRFB funds.

Requested additional funding for project number 4 (02-1485, Chimacum Creek Estuary Riparian Acquisition).

Quinault Nation:

Spokesperson(s): John Sims

This lead entity submitted a list containing 4 projects requesting a total of \$961,217 in SRFB funds.

John thanked the Board Technical Panel for their willingness to work with the Quinault Nation lead entity in previous rounds with some unusual habitat projects that are just now showing some signs of success.

Requested additional funding for project number 4 (02-1530, Salmon River Tributary 21-0143 Culvert Barrier). The US Forest Service has secured Title II funding for the engineering design for this project and is proceeding with finalizing those plans.

John mentioned the past practice of the Board conditioning some projects to bring back to be funded at a later date.

Larry Cassidy asked about the high cost for fertilizer in project number one (02-1531, Lake Quinault Fertilization). John noted this is a five-year project with one-time costs for equipment needs.

Grays Harbor County:

Spokesperson(s): Lee Napier and Chad Stussy

This lead entity submitted a list containing 15 projects requesting a total of \$3,290,908 in SRFB funds.

Requested additional funding for projects 5 and 6 (02-1446, Centralia Riparian Restoration Project and 02-1447, Wynoochee #4 Barrier Correction).

Pacific County:

Spokesperson(s): Mike Johnson and Don Amend

This lead entity submitted a list containing 8 projects requesting a total of \$708,425 in SRFB funds.

Requested funding for projects 4, 5, and 6 on their list (02-1465, Mid Nemah Stream; 02-1464, Finn Creek Restoration; and 02-1586, Palix Watershed Habitat Assessment). They are a lead entity with a proven track record, a strategy, and these projects are all key to the Pacific County strategy.

Brenda McMurray is concerned with the funding of project number one (02-1572, Upper Willapa River Riparian Restoration) and feels there may be a better source of funding for this type project and, if funded, would like it monitored very closely.

Chair Ruckelshaus and Steve Tharinger agree with Brenda and would also want this project closely watched and believes there could be other ways to fund.

Snake River Salmon Recovery Board:

Spokesperson(s): Brad Johnson, Steve Martin, Terry Bruegman, and Mark Walkman
This lead entity submitted a list containing 4 projects requesting a total of \$570,083 in SRFB funds.

Agree with the staff recommendation and Technical Panel ratings. Would like to request funding for the fourth project (02-1604, Nordheim Riparian Enhancement). This is a small cost project, developed by a private landowner, and meets the local strategy. This is also very unique project and an outreach opportunity.

Klickitat County:

Spokesperson(s): Dave McClure

This lead entity submitted a list containing 1 project requesting a total of \$64,293 in SRFB funds.

Yakima River Basin Salmon Recovery Board:

Spokesperson(s): Richard Visser and Jim Armstrong

This lead entity submitted a list containing 13 projects requesting a total of \$2,887,429 in SRFB funds.

Requested additional funding for projects 5, 6, and 7 on the list (02-1614, Snow Mountain Ranch Acquisition and Barrier Removal; 02-1617, Lower Naches Critical Habitat Protection; and 02-1603, Lummuma Creek Restoration Phase II).

One project had been removed from the list, by the sponsor and lead entity, prior to publication of the list (02-1607, Lower Cabin Creek Acquisition). The local group saw benefits in removing this low benefit medium certainty project from the list since the SRFB doesn't usually jump projects rated low/med. The local technical committee still believes this is a good project. They would also like to request funding for this project.

Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board:

Spokesperson(s): County Commissioner Ron Walters, Jennifer Jerabek, Julie Dagnon, and Keith Wolf

This lead entity submitted a list containing 17 projects requesting a total of \$9,371,955 in SRFB funds.

Requested a higher proportion of SRFB funds to continue the work in this area.
Reminded the Board that they are looking at three lead entity lists merged into one.

Julie Dagnon supports funding of the currently recommended projects 1, 2 and 4 on the list. She also requested funding of the number 3 project (02-1469, Foster and Moses Coulee Watershed Assessment). This is the number one project for the Foster County lead entity. She also requested additional funding for the number 5, 6, and 8 projects on the list (02-1414, White River Habitat Acquisition; 02-1638, Eyhott Island and Nearshore Acquisition; and 02-1644, Lower Twisp River Habitat Acquisition).

Chair Ruckelshaus reiterated the current funding situation and the amount of money it looks like the SRFB has to spend this biennium.

Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board (LCFRB):

Spokesperson(s): Jeff Breckel

This lead entity submitted a list containing 17 projects requesting a total of \$2,784,413 in SRFB funds.

The LCFRB was very disturbed with the staff proposal and the Technical Panel ratings. The LCFRB covers five WRIAs. Last year they had six projects. The state says a regional approach will receive preference and yet they were penalized this year. Disappointed with the Technical Panel ratings; this may be due to a disconnect in communication.

Requesting additional funding for projects 4-12 on the list (02-1521, Watershed Nutrient Assessment; 02-1518, Regional Culvert Inventory; 02-1499, Yanzik Off-Channel Rearing Pond; 02-1514, Little Washougal River Restoration; 02-1443, Coweeman River Riparian Restoration; 02-1517, Lower Washougal Restoration Feasibility Study; 02-1510, Grays River Topo and Geomorphic Survey; 02-1520, Hendrickson Creek Stream Restoration; 02-1512, Grays River Water District Bar).

Brenda McMurray also was surprised with the Technical Panel rankings but after looking through the list, felt it may not have been as multi-faceted as in the past. These are pretty basic projects for a lead entity that has been in existence for so long.

Jeff replied that they are fairly basic, but it is a large area and many of the projects are extensions on previously funded projects.

Steve Tharinger agrees with Jeff's concern on funding of larger areas and the Board will need to figure this out before making funding decisions.

Pend Oreille Conservation District:

Spokesperson(s): Don Commins, Sandi Lembcke, and city Councilwoman Leanna Powers

This lead entity submitted a list containing 1 project requesting a total of \$641,653 in SRFB funds.

Don thanked staff for their support. Urged the Board to fund the one project on their list. The limiting factors and strategy support the project in addition to both technical and local community support.

Sandi Lemcke reported that the project is good science for bull trout. The Cedar Creek dam is the limiting factor for bull trout; habitat above the dam is excellent. Community support is high. Ecology will give another \$10,000 if this project gets funded.

Leanna Powers, City Councilwoman for city of lone, testified that the dam was built in 1910. It is essential for this dam to be removed. If the dam isn't removed the Department of Ecology will fine the city \$100 per day. The city can't afford this.

Jim Peters likes this project since they took a dam out in his area and it worked. He is concerned with the low rating and wondered if there are things that can be done to help raise the rating.

Brenda McMurray thinks there may need to be more fleshing out of the benefit to the fish.

The Board discussed the different types of species in this area and how some fish are not compatible with others.

Larry Cassidy noted that West Coast cutthroat are a potentially listed species in the area and they are a great recreational fishing resource where bull trout are not.

Open Public Comment:

Carolyn Kelly, Skagit Conservation District, testified on the Skagit list. There are no poor projects on this list. Projects need to be funded and urged the Board to fund as far down the list as possible.

Todd Mitchell, Swinomish Tribe, testified on the Hornsby Creek project and read letter from the chairman of the Swinomish Tribe.

Peter Bahls, Northwest Watershed, testified on Hood Canal's #10 project, Tarboo Bay. The Hood Canal needs to have a higher level of funding due to its size and complexity. Mr. Bails gave his reasons why this project should be included in the Hood Canal funding.

David Moskowitz, Wild Salmon Center, appreciated the Board hearing his testimony. Thanked the Board for recommending funding for the Elk Creek project. Also thanked the project partners on this project. Told about a nurse, Becky Dixon from Forks, who was the power behind this project. This is a classic example of citizen involvement.

Gordon Congdon, Chelan Douglas Land Trust, requested funding of the White River project from the Upper Columbia Region. This is a project that should be funded. He submitted a letter suggesting the Board fund half this year and half next year – although he's not sure the Board can do this. Another approach would be to fund projects 6 and 8 before funding their projects. Would like at least a portion of the funding.

Eve Dixon, North Olympic Land Trust, thanked the Board.

End of public testimony.

Recessed for the night at 8:25 p.m. to reconvene at 8:15 a.m. May 2.

Day 2

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Larry Cassidy	Vancouver
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
James Peters	Olympia
Steve Tharinger	Clallam County
Ed Manary	Designee, Conservation Commission
Tim Smith	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Dick Wallace	Designee, Department of Ecology
Shari Schaftlein	Designee, Department of Transportation

Meeting reconvened at 8:20 a.m.

The Chair opened the meeting with a discussion on how to proceed with a way to make a decision. Mr. Ruckelshaus agreed with the lead entity comments yesterday on how hard the people in the watersheds work to compile and submit the lists. The hard part for the Board is following the statutory guidance from the Legislature to decide the funding.

This Board was created by the Legislature. Its assignment was given by the Legislature. The Board is directed to fund projects using the best science and to use equity in distribution of funds, although equity was not defined. It is also to use:

- Tools to assess the needs of fish in the watershed (Limiting Factors Analysis),
- Strategies to identify and fund projects (several very good strategies),
- Local technical committee, and
- A citizen's committee to recommend priority of projects to be funded in the area.

The Board has also created a SRFB Technical Panel to review the strategies and projects on a statewide basis.

In this grant cycle, staff developed a funding approach. Some lead entity areas are very complex and those areas appear to be shorted in this approach. The Board may need to make some adjustments to the staff recommendations in these areas.

The Chair suggested capping the available funds for the 4th Round at \$22 million for projects. That leaves \$5 million to fund lead entities and regional boards if the Legislature doesn't fund for the next biennium. The lead entities and regional boards are key to the success of the overall process.

Use staff recommendation, the Chair will entertain motion(s) to accept staff recommendation, then go through each lead entity list. Then come back to see where we are. The Chair is aware this is not going to make everyone happy; it doesn't make the Board happy.

Larry Cassidy agreed with the Chair that it is smart to set aside some funds for the lead entities and the regional boards, but wondered if it was enough. If the Legislature does

provide the lead entities and regional boards with funding, can the Board fund additional projects from this grant cycle or does it need to wait until the next grant cycle?

The Chair responded that in June (or once the Legislature has a final budget in place) the Board will need to determine the budget for the regional boards and lead entities and then decide how to proceed.

Steve Tharinger also supported the approach the Chair set out. He would not want to wait for another grant round but would prefer to have a richer conditional list for possible funding in June.

Brenda McMurray wanted to make sure the message is clear that reserving the money for the lead entities and regional boards is at the expense of funding some very good projects that have gone through a rigorous process.

Dick Wallace talked about a grant cycle timing to help with the funding. A later start in the next cycle would give staff time to close projects and find out the budget for the future rounds. He sees a number of benefits in a later grant cycle.

The Chair supported the need to look at all the issues before deciding on the timing of the next round.

Brenda McMurray agreed the Board should stay within a \$22 million cap, but put projects on a conditional list for funding once the '03 state money is decided. Make it very clear that today's funding decision is not final, but it is dependent on what the state Legislature funds.

Ed Manary supported the Chair's conservative approach. Supports the need to keep the infrastructure intact.

Craig Partridge also supports the approach as prudent.

FOURTH ROUND GRANT CYCLE - DECISIONS

Pend Oreille

Staff recommended provisional funding of the one project on this list (02-1461, Cedar River Fish Passage Restoration).

The Board discussed the need to have the state agencies work together with the City of Lone to better understand the fish management issues. The Board has concern with funding this but would like to help the town.

Funding of this project died for the **lack of a motion**. The Board will help put together a task force to assist the town with a plan.

Snake River

Staff recommended funding first three projects on this list (02-1544, Tucannon River Screens Phase 2; 02-1543, Walla Walla Urban Fish Screens and Meters; and 02-1540, Touchet River Screens Phase 2).

Larry Cassidy **moved** to approve projects #1 through #3. Jim Peters **seconded**.

Larry made a motion to **add** the 4th project. Steve Tharinger **seconded** the motion

Board **approved** amended list.

Upper Columbia

Staff recommended funding three projects on this list (02-1634, Lower Icicle Reach-Level Assessment; 02-1524, Chewuch Basin Irrigators Conveyance; and 02-1469, Foster & Moses Coulee Watershed Assessment).

Brenda McMurray has concern with the second project and making sure the water is kept in stream for fish.

Larry Cassidy believes the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) will ensure the water is kept in stream.

Brenda does not want the Board to be a funding source that provides funding for irrigation systems that do not increase water in the stream for fish.

Dick Wallace believes additional water will be kept in stream and will have Ecology staff work with SRFB staff to ensure this.

Brenda would like a special condition on this project to guarantee saved water will be returned to the stream.

Brenda **moved** to fund projects 1, 2, and 4. Larry Cassidy **seconded**. Board **approved** list as presented.

Yakima River

Staff recommended funding first four projects on this list (02-1527, Diversion 14 Fish Screen – Ahtanum Creek; 02-1494, Coleman Creek Fish Access; 02-1656, Dry/Cabin Creek Fish Passage and Screening; and 02-1612, Riparian Enhancement Team – Phase 2).

Brenda McMurray would like to include project 5 (02-1614, Snow Mountain Ranch Acquisition and Barrier Removal) on the conditional funding list. This project is high cost but rated high benefit and high certainty by the SRFB Technical Panel. It fits the lead entity strategy and involves a group that, if the project is funded, will bring increased salmon recovery involvement in the Yakima area.

Brenda McMurray **moved** to approve projects 1 through 4 and add project 5 in the conditional funding status. Steve Tharinger **seconded**. Board **approved** the amended list.

Klickitat County

Staff recommended funding the one project on this list (02-1636, Assessment of the White Salmon Watershed).

Larry Cassidy **moved** to approve the one project. Steve Tharinger **seconded**. Board **approved** the list as presented.

Lower Columbia

Staff recommended funding the first three projects on the list (02-1506, Doty Habitat Restoration Project; 02-1515, Upper Trout Creek Restoration; and 02-1498, Abernathy Creek Riparian Restoration).

Larry Cassidy noted that the Lower Columbia presents the biggest problem for the Board. Would like the Board to fund the first three projects and also include project #5 (02-1518, Regional Culvert Inventory), which is rated by the SRFB Technical Panel as high benefit and high certainty.

Larry Cassidy **moved** to fund projects 1 through 3 and include project 5. Jim Peters **seconded**. Board **approved** the list as amended.

Pacific County

Staff recommended funding first three projects on this list (02-1572, Upper Willapa River Riparian Restoration; 02-1463, Salmon Creek; 02-1458, Oxbow Culvert Design).

Larry Cassidy **moved** approval of three projects as recommended by staff. Steve Tharinger **seconded**. Board **approved** list as presented.

Grays Harbor

Staff recommended funding first four projects on this list (02-1440, Lewis County Habitat Assessment Phase 2; 02-1437, Darlin Creek Acquisition and Restoration; 02-1441, Four Basin Fish Passage Assessment; and 02-1445, Satsop Floodplain Restoration).

Larry Cassidy **moved** to approve first four recommended projects and add project 6 (02-1447, Wynoochee #4 Barrier Correction) on the conditional funding list. Jim Peters **seconded**.

Brenda McMurray would amend to also add project 5 (02-1446, Centralia Riparian Restoration Project) to the conditional funding list since she doesn't believe the Board should skip over a medium benefit medium certainty project to get to a high benefit high certainty project.

Larry Cassidy amended his motion to include both projects 5 and 6. Steve Tharinger **seconded**. Board **approved** list as amended to fund first four projects and include projects 5 and 6 on the conditional funding list.

Quinault Nation

Staff recommended funding the first three projects on this list (02-1531, Lake Quinault Fertilization; 02-1439, Hulten Creek Barrier Culvert Correction; and 02-1602, Donkey Creek Culvert).

Larry Cassidy **moved** to approve the first three projects and add project 4 (02-1530, Salmon River Tributary 21-0143 Culvert Barrier) to the conditional funding list. Steve Tharinger **seconded**. Board **approved** as amended.

North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity (NOPE)

Staff recommended funding the first four projects on this list (02-1621, Sequim Prairie Tri-Irrigation; 02-1573, Lake Pleasant and Lake Creek Conservation; 02-1528, Jimmycomelately Creek Bridge/Channel; and 02-1545, Elk Creek Acquisition).

Steve Tharinger discussed this list and merits of projects 5 and 6 (02-1583, Deep Creek and South Fork Pysht Rvier Large Woody Debris Restoration and 02-1581, Brownes Creek Instream Habitat Restoration). He would like to approve projects 1 through 4 with adding projects 5 and 6 on the conditional funding list.

Steve Tharinger moved to **approve** projects 1 through 4 and amend to add projects 5 and 6 to the conditional funding list. Larry Cassidy **seconded**.

Brenda McMurray would like to use project 02-1621 as a guide to see how this project can be used as an example to guide in the future. Dick Wallace agreed.

Board **approved** list as amended to fund the first four projects and include projects 5 and 6 to the conditional funding list.

Hood Canal Coordinating Council (HCCC)

Staff recommended funding the first four projects on this list (02-1560, Skokomish River Nalley Island Levee Removal; 02-1471, Historical and Contemporary Nearshore Habitats; 02-1475, Shine Estuary Restoration; 02-1482, Dosewallips Estuary Restoration Phase 1).

Chair Ruckelshaus noted that this is another multi-WRIA group that during this funding cycle came up a little short. The Technical Panel may have made a rating on the 5th project without enough information. The Chair would like to include funding of project 5 (02-1485, Chimacum Creek Estuary Riparian Acquisition) and include the 6th project (02-1523, Ghost Net Removal) on the conditional funding list.

Steve Tharinger thought the Board might get a programmatic funding request for ghost net removal. Could condition the 6th project on whether or not it will fit with the ghost net removal project proposed by the NW Straits Commission.

Mike Ramsey noted that this project would not fall under the NW Straits Commission's proposal.

Steve Tharinger **moved** to approve projects 1 through 4, adding the 5th project for funding and the 6th project on the conditional funding list. Larry Cassidy **seconded**.

Jim Peters would actually swap the 5th and 6th projects as conditional on 5th and funding 6th project. No additional action was taken on this proposal.

Board **approved** funding of this list as amended to include projects 1 through 5 and add project 6 to the conditional funding list.

Kitsap County

Staff recommended funding the first three projects on this list (02-1592, Curley Creek Estuary Acquisition; 02-1551, Carpenter Creek/Appletree Creek Restoration; and 02-1556, Barker Creek Estuary Culvert Replacement).

Steve Tharinger **moved** to adopt the list as recommended by staff. Brenda McMurray **seconded**. Board **approved** the list as presented.

Mason Conservation District

Staff recommended funding the first three projects on this list (02-1574, Malaney Creek Fish Passage Project; 02-1591, Little Skookum Valley, Phase 1: Passage; and 02-1444, Little Skookum Valley, Phase II: Riparian).

Brenda McMurray **moved** to adopt the list as recommended by staff. Steve Tharinger **seconded**. Board **approved** the list as presented.

Jim Peters recused himself from voting on this list.

Thurston County Conservation District

Staff recommended funding the first three projects on this list (02-1529, Gull Harbor Conservation; 02-1483, Perkins Creek Fish Passage; 02-1477, WRIA 13 Prioritization and Development).

Larry Cassidy **moved** to adopt the list as recommended by staff. Brenda McMurray **seconded**. Board **approved** the list as presented.

Jim Peters recused himself from voting on this list.

Nisqually River

Staff recommended funding the first three projects on this list (02-1552, Nisqually Estuary/Red Salmon Slough Restoration; 02-1476, Nisqually River Shoreline Protection; and 02-1479, Weyco Ohop Shoreline Acquisition).

Larry Cassidy **moved** to adopt the list as recommended by staff. Steve Tharinger **seconded**.

Chair Ruckelshaus recused himself from voting on this list.

Board **approved** the list as presented.

Pierce County

Staff recommended provisional funding of the first two projects (02-1585, Boise Creek Restoration; and 02-1582, West Hylebos Creek Restoration/Preservation) and funding of the third project (02-1579, Foothills Trail Culvert Replacement).

Larry Cassidy **moved** to approve project 3 and 6 (02-1584, South Prairie Creek Habitat Acquisition) only. Jim Peters **seconded**.

The Board discussed the merits of project 2 and changing of the projects at the 11th hour.

Shari Schaftlein, WSDOT, discussed the mitigation of projects such as this and the policies surrounding this issue. There is a need to figure out how to combine the WSDOT and SRFB processes to help both the mitigation side, as well as the policy side.

Four Board members **approved** the recommendation, Brenda McMurray **opposed**. Projects number 3 and 6 were **approved** for funding.

King (WRIA 8)

Staff recommended funding the first two projects on this list (02-1622, Issaquah Creek Log Cabin Reach Acquisition and 02-1624, Cedar Rapids Floodplain).

Larry Cassidy **moved** to approve this list as recommended by staff. Jim Peters **seconded**. Board **approved** the list as presented.

King (WRIA 9)

Staff recommended funding the first two projects on this list (02-1532, Habitat Inventory and Utilization and 02-1601, Lower Green River Acquisition).

Larry Cassidy **moved** to approve the list as recommended by staff. Steve Tharinger **seconded**.

Steve Tharinger voiced some concern with project 2 and believes project 3 (02-1588, Kanaskat – Phase 3) would be a better choice for funding.

Brenda McMurray proposed adding project 3 to the conditional funding list.

Jim Peters agreed with including project 3 on the conditional funding list.

Larry Cassidy **amended** his motion to include project 3 on the conditional funding list.

Jim Peters **seconded** the amendment. Board **approved** the list as amended to fund projects 1 and 2 and add project 3 to the conditional funding list.

Snohomish County

Staff recommended provisional funding of the number one project (02-1629, Persons Eddy Acquisition) and funding of projects 2-4 (02-1623, Snohomish River Confluence

Reach Restoration; 02-1609, Skykomish River Braided Reach Restoration Assessment; and 02-1643, Lower Tolt River Floodplain Reconnection).

Larry Cassidy **moved** to approve funding of projects 2, 3, and 4. Jim Peters **seconded**.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked if this motion kept the number one project on the provisional list. Larry Cassidy reworded his motion to include project 1 on the provisional list.

Four Board members **approved** the list as recommended. Steve Tharinger opposed.

Island County

Staff recommended funding the first project on this list (02-1460, English Boom-Leque Island Acquisition and Restoration).

Larry Cassidy **moved** to approve the list as recommended by staff. Brenda McMurray **seconded**. Board **approved** the list as recommended by staff.

Stillaguamish (WRIA 5)

Staff recommended funding the first three projects on this list (02-1589, Smoke Farm North Floodplain Acquisition and Restoration; 02-1606, Oso Loop Rearing Habitat Restoration; and 02-1596, Little Deer Erosion Control).

Brenda McMurray **moved** to approve the list as recommended by staff. Steve Tharinger **seconded**. Board **approved** the list as recommended by staff.

Skagit Watershed Council

Staff recommended funding the first four projects on this list (02-1492, Wiley Slough Restoration Design; 02-1616, Vandersar Restoration; 02-1625, South Fork Skagit Levee Setback Acquisition and Restoration; and 02-1561, Edgewater Park Off-Channel Restoration).

Steve Tharinger **moved** to approve the first four projects and add projects 5 and 6 (02-1563, Fornsby Creek SRT and 02-1620, Minkler Lake Acquisition) to the conditional funding list. Larry Cassidy **seconded**.

Dick Wallace noted that project 5 is the broader reaching and more inclusive than other projects on the list.

Steve Tharinger **amended** his motion to approve projects 1-5 for funding with project 6 included on the conditional funding list. Larry Cassidy **seconded** this amendment. Board **approved** the list as amended.

San Juan CD

Staff recommended funding both projects on this list (02-1467, Herring Spawn Survey Phase III and 02-1577, Bridge/Restoration Design).

Larry Cassidy **moved** to approve the list as recommended by staff. Brenda McMurray **seconded**. Board **approved** the list as presented.

Whatcom County

Staff recommended funding the first three projects on this list (02-1500, Acme-to-Confluence Reach Assessment; 02-1630, Middle Fork Nooksack Side Channel Improvement; and 02-1648, Kwina Slough Acquisition and Riparian Restoration).

Larry Cassidy **moved** to approve the list as recommended by staff. Steve Tharinger **seconded**. Board **approved** the list as presented.

Totals

Staff reported that the Board had just approved 70 projects for \$21,831,394 in funding. In addition 9 projects totaling \$2,740,594 were conditioned on available funds and one project for \$367,000 is dependent on project redevelopment and additional review, for a total of \$24,938,988.

Chair Ruckelshaus suggested final approval of the first 70 projects and waiting until June for final consideration of the conditional and provisional projects. Larry Cassidy supported the idea. Brenda McMurray asked if the conditional list would be reported as a conditional list depending on funding level. Yes, this list will be funded if the budget allows.

Since the recommended list falls below the \$22 million cap, Ed Manary asked to include the number 6 Skagit project (02-1620, Minkler Lake Acquisition) onto the funded projects list. The Board did not support this request.

Brenda McMurray would like to put the conditional projects on an alternate list. Dick Wallace suggested rank ordering the list of projects in June. There may not be enough funding to fund all the projects on the conditional funding list but some funding may become available through administrative closures or other previously funded project changes. Steve Tharinger would like staff to draft an alternate list for review in June. Director Johnson noted that policies are not in place to develop a prioritized statewide alternate list.

Brenda McMurray noted that while there were difficulties in distributing funds and therefore disappointing to many, there were actually some very good projects approved for funding. These projects all came through a local lead entity process with a state technical review. This is a very rigorous process on all levels, but everyone still needs to feel good participating in a process that is open and one that is involving a lot of citizens that in the past history of salmon recovery have not been engaged.

5TH ROUND ISSUES

Rollie reviewed the 5th Round Issues working groups.

Brenda McMurray noted that in the discussion of the workshop, additional issues were identified that need to be addressed prior to the 6th Round.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked Director Johnson to gather the issues and align them in an appropriate order for future discussion.

Dick Wallace feels all the “maybes” on the list should be addressed before the 5th Round.

Performance measures are an issue that still needs to be addressed.

Monitoring Effectiveness (See notebook for details)

Bruce Crawford provided the Board with an update on the status of Effectiveness Monitoring issues.

Bruce went over seven key policy issues for the Board’s consideration.

Bruce is seeking the Board’s advice and direction for both policy development and database revisions.

Chair Ruckelshaus would like to see a matrix outlining the costs associated with each of the decisions.

Bruce announced the data portal will launch later in the month. This is the first attempt to pull together all the state agency databases with information in a particular watershed or WRIA.

Ed Manary asked if the federal government will be requiring monitoring in the next funding cycle. Bruce reported that the next federal funding will have monitoring and reporting requirements. Bruce is working with the different groups involved to confirm the monitoring requirements.

Dick Wallace reinforced the need to continue the momentum started with the Monitoring Oversight Committee. Bruce will be working to determine what questions NOAA Fisheries wants answered in salmon recovery efforts.

Jay Watson reported that LEAG and most lead entities are concerned about delaying the next round until the issues are decided. Some of the items will take months or years to make decisions on and each cycle needs to be revised as things change. There will always be a need for revisions to the process.

Chair Ruckelshaus wanted to know exactly what the lead entities feel the grant cycle should be and why. The Board needs to make sure the rationale is shared with everyone.

PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION ON REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS’ 03-05 OPERATING BUDGET

Steve Meyer reported that the Governor’s Salmon Recovery Office is working with the Council of Regions on the recommendations for regional funding amounts. They hope to have some recommendations by the end of the month to present at the June SRFB meeting.

Shari Schaftlein asked Steve for an update on the Independent Science Panel's (ISP) stormwater review. Steve reported it is still on schedule to be released in June.

PARTNER AGENCY COMMENTS

Shari Schaftlein, WSDOT reported:

- Department of Transportation (WSDOT) does have a budget.
- The “nickel” project list will be posted on the WSDOT web page.
- The streamlining bill did pass. Will continue to work with partners to streamline permitting.

Dick Wallace, Ecology, reported:

- The Yakima Planning Unit has approved the first 2514 planning effort. Several more should also be completed this year.
- Watershed bill is part of a complex package of water bills
- An instream flow guidance document has been developed to assist people when setting instream flows.
- The Water Quality Standards Proposal is currently in public review and should go to rule in early July. These standards also need to go through Section 7 review.
- Stormwater efforts are still progressing.
- An updated shoreline rule bill has passed the Legislature. Ecology hopes to get the funding to pass through to the locals for the shoreline work. This rule would require no net loss of shoreline.

Tim Smith, WDFW, reported:

- Sara LaBorde is leaving the agency and that Jerry Alb, WSDOT, has been hired on an Interagency Personnel Agreement (IPA) to fill Sara's vacant position.
- The lead entity workshop steering committee lead was Janet Kearsley. Doug Osterman is now her replacement for the group.
- Governor's letter to the Congress on nearshore – Scott Redman will be working on the nearshore project 60% of his time. He started working on this project last week.
- Nearshore project budget in '03 is \$700,000. There is a construction element estimating a cost of \$7-10 billion over the next 50 years. Will need to discuss with SRFB how the PAC Salmon money and this project fit together.
- A “lessons learned” document for funding nearshore projects has been developed. Starting the outreach on this document.

Craig Partridge, DNR, reported:

- Family Forest Landowner Bill passed. This bill shows \$2 million included in the SRFB budget in all the budget proposals. The Department of Natural Resources will need to coordinate with SRFB and lead entities on this issue.

Brenda McMurray updated the Board on the lead entity workshop on May 15 and 16. There is an expectation that items from the workshop will come back to the Board for policy development so Brenda encouraged Board members to attend. Trying to limit the number of workshop attendees to 100.

Chair Ruckelshaus thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

SRFB APPROVAL:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair

Date

Future Meetings: June 4 & 5, 2003 – Vancouver, WSU Campus
 July 2, 2003 – Cedar River Watershed Education Center